### **ATTACHMENT 6**



# ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW CASE SUMMARY

3427 SEA LEDGE LN

MST2006-00092

#### R-MAJOR ADDITION

Page: 1

## **Project Description:**

This is a revised project description. The proposal consists of the demolition of the existing 460 square foot attached two-car garage and 1,218 square feet of the existing residence in preparation for a remodel and two-story addition including 1,551 square feet for the first floor, 1,016 square for the second floor, a new 612 square foot basement and a new 540 square foot attached two-car garage for a net increase of 2,041 square feet all on a 32,189 square foot A-1/SD-3 zoned lot in the Hillside Design District and the Appealable Jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone. The project site is currently developed with a 2,954 square foot one-story single-family residence with an attached 460 square foot two-car garage. The proposal also includes resurfacing the existing 565 square foot deck and replacement of the guardrail, replacement of a retaining wall and the replacement of the existing septic system and drywells. When the project is complete, the development on the site will consist of a 5,455 square foot two-story residence which includes the 612 square foot basement and a 540 square foot attached two-car garage. A modification is requested to allow an "as-built" portion of an existing deck to encroach into the 15' required interior yard setback.

Activities:

4/3/2006

ABR-Concept Review (Continued)

(Second Concept Review.)

(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL FOR A COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS AND MODIFICATIONS.)

(5:14)

Leon F. Lunt, Owner; Bob Price, Applicant; and Andy Roteman, Architect, and Paul Wolthausen, Landscape Architect, present.

Public comment opened at 5:33 p.m.

Ms. Paula Nelson, neighbor, expressed general support of the project.

Public comment closed at 5:34 p.m.

Clarification of a portion of the Minutes from March 13, 2006: Comment#2 - "The Board cannot make

Page: 2

#### Activities:

the findings to support the proposed modifications. The proposal should stay within the buildable area on the site to avoid modifications on the east and west sides, and restudy the floor plan configurations to reduce the scale of the house." The italicized portion of the comment has been specifically clarified as "...restudy the scale of the floor plan configurations back within the buildable envelope."

Motion: Continued indefinitely to Planning Commission with the following comments: (previous comments #1, #3, and #5 carried forward\*) 1) The proposed renovations and additions to the existing 1960's modern home are compatible with the original design style.\* 2) The majority of the Board remains neutral regarding the requested modification of the westside breakfast room and finds that it does not impact the aesthetic quality of the house as seen from the ocean or neighbors, and as the request is not a design necessity, the Board will defer the determination of this request to the Planning Commission. 3) The Board appreciates the elimination of the prior requested modifications for the westside family room and for the master bedroom addition. 4) The contemporary style of house, and butterfly second-story roof expression is appropriate to project site conditions and not detrimental to surrounding neighbors.\* 5) The Board would still like to see the introduction of additional tall vegetation to help mask the two-story structure as seen from the east. 6) The undulating roof overhangs and extended trellises mitigate the linearity of the house as it extends toward the bluff.\* 7) The Board appreciates the reduction in the length of the proposed bluff guard rail and finds that the revised design is an aesthetic enhancement. 8) The Board appreciates the increased landscaping along the private driveway and the reduction in the length of the fence abutting the driveway giving the entry component of the house and the landscaping more exposure. 9) The Board suggests further study of other aesthetics options other than the use of gravel to the eastside of the driveway. 10) The Board understands that the applicant will utilize darker materials to minimize glare. 11) The proposed roof structure over the second-story balcony needs further refinement in terms of its proportions, and the angled corners at the proposed master bedroom addition requires further study. 12) In order to address the concerns of the northern neighbor, the applicant should attempt to minimize the effect of night glare from the windows. especially from the second-floor entry glazing, by using a possible opaque glazing or by altering the exposure of the interior lighting. Action: Sherry/Mudge, 5/0/0.

3/13/2006

# ABR-Concept Review (New) - PH

(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL FOR A COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FINDINGS AND MODIFICATIONS.)

(6:33)

Bob Price, Applicant; and Andy Roteman of Roteman, Eberhard & Associates, present.

No Power Point presentation was shown due to technical difficulty on the part of the applicant.

Public comment opened at 6:53 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, closed at 6:54 p.m.

Motion: Continued three weeks to Full Board with the following comments: 1) The proposed renovations and additions to existing 1960's modern home are compatible with the original design style. 2) The

Page: 3

#### Activities:

Board cannot make the findings to support the proposed modifications. The proposal should stay within the buildable area on the site to avoid modifications on the east and west sides, and restudy the floor plan configurations to reduce the scale of the house. 3) The contemporary style of house, and butterfly second-story roof expression is appropriate to project site conditions and not detrimental to surrounding neighbors. 4) Use tall vegetation to help mask the two-story structure from easterly neighbors. 5) The undulating roof overhangs and extended trellises mitigate the linearity of the house as it extends toward the bluff. 6) Reduce the length of the proposed bluff guardrail, especially in the area near the proposed kitchen to avoid visual impacts as seen from the beach. 7) Paving and landscaping should be enhanced along the private drive, especially where the existing driveway has been removed.

8) Utilize dark materials to minimize glare. 9) The low profile roof on the existing one-story house helps soften the appearance of the new two-story element behind.

Action: Sherry/Mosel, 5/0/0 (Romano, LeCron, and Wienke absent).

3/13/2006

ABR-Optional Notice Prepared

2/16/2006

ABR-Resubmittal Received

Received first ABR submittal.